

DRAFT DIOXIN/FURAN WORKGROUP CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

July 31, 2003

Workgroup Leaders:

Anita Wong, EC

Erin White Newman, EPA

Introduction and Meeting Objectives

John Menkedick (Battelle) welcomed everyone and introduced the meeting agenda. He explained that the intent of the meeting was to get comments on the draft Dioxin Workgroup Workplan and to begin discussions on the plan's future implementation.

Anita Wong (EC) provided background information on the Workplan. She explained that a decision-tree process had been used by the workgroup over the years to determine priority sectors. However, a need developed within the past year to update and review the priority sectors and develop a plan for addressing them. Some of the issues identified through the decision-tree process are now outdated or have already been addressed, such as incineration (addressed through Maximum Achievable Control Technology standards and Canada-Wide Standards), wood burning, and burn barrels. Now, Anita stressed, it is important for the Workgroup to focus on remaining issues. To that end, Erin White (USEPA) and Anita drafted a Dioxin Workgroup Workplan proposing activities over the next two years. They are looking for feedback from the Workgroup on whether the priorities they have identified in the Workplan are appropriate and whether the plan will be effective in making progress toward Virtual Elimination and Binational Toxics Strategy (BTS) goals.

Erin Newman added that this is a good time for re-evaluation of priorities, since the 2000 U.S. National Dioxin/Furan Inventory will soon be available, along with several years of new National Dioxin Air Monitoring Network (NDAMN) data. Also, there may be some opportunity to obtain updated information from the Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network (IADN).

Anita mentioned that Canada is also updating their inventory and reminded the Workgroup to consider other national programs relevant to dioxins/furans already underway when setting goals in the Workplan; this will avoid duplication of effort.

Draft Workplan for the Dioxin/Furan Workgroup: Review and Comments

In reviewing the Draft Workplan, the Workgroup discussed the plan's seven proposed focus areas for priority activity:

- Section 1: Continue to assess information coming out of national programs. The USEPA and EC will keep the Workgroup updated on ongoing national efforts in the U.S. and Canada.
- Section 2: Work on better characterizing sources, specifically within the Great Lakes Basin
 - It was noted by a workgroup member that what was needed was a presentation on the big picture of monitoring data and related information, as all the different information sources was sometimes overwhelming and/or confusing.
 - Dwain Winters (USEPA) suggested separating the source characterization and inventory sections from the ambient monitoring data. Erin responded by saying that the proposed task was to break out the Basin data by taking a subset of the U.S. Dioxin Inventory and looking specifically at Basin sources.
 - Dwain noted that when the U.S. Dioxin Inventory goes out for public review, the group will find out if sources have been missed or incorrect characterizations have been made.
 - Anita added that by reviewing the U.S. and Canadian Dioxin Inventories, and identifying data gaps in the Great Lakes area, an additional benefit might be industry responding with efforts to provide more information and develop an inventory for the Basin, possibly resulting in some new partnerships to conduct stack testing. Dwain noted, however, that many of the poorly characterized sources might not be industrial, or they might not be the easily tested/stack-testing types (e.g., small scale copper wire processing facilities).
 - Dwain indicated that extracting Great Lakes information should be fairly easy, but stressed the importance of defining what would be considered the “Great Lakes Basin” when extracting the Basin data from the U.S. Dioxin Inventory.
 - John reviewed the workgroups suggestions: 1) that this task should be split into environmental/ambient monitoring, and 2) To better characterize sources of concern, information could be extracted for the Great Lakes from the updated U.S. Dioxin Inventory and the Canadian inventory.
 - Erin discussed the option of engaging Workgroup members to help get more information on poorly characterized sources in the Great Lakes Basin.
 - Erin also raised the possibility of soliciting interest from sectors in getting more information. Dwain suggested that engaging sectors feeds into the next step (section 3 of the Workplan).
 - Dwain also suggested that the list of poorly characterized sources be reviewed. Some of these sources include ball clay processing (no facilities are known to be located in the basin), foundries, and asphalt mixing

plants. He added, however, that some of the U.S. information may also be useful to Canada.

- Anita responded that the list definitely needed to be reviewed, but that even small-scale operations could represent local contamination problems. She raised the possibility that a status report may be needed on each section of the list, and proposed a separate conference call after the updated U.S. Dioxin Inventory is released. Erin agreed and proposed that it would be simpler to just extract information from the U.S. Dioxin Inventory on a state-specific basis, as opposed to the more complicated watershed basis.
- Section 3: Engage sectors.
 - Dwain commented that this section could use more focus and that clarification needs to be made between sectors and source categories. Discussion and suggestion on how to handle this followed.
 - Erin agreed and shared the two goals of this section: 1) to gain more information where there are gaps and, wherever risks have been identified, to work with each sector to manage those risks.
 - Dwain added that pathway intervention may be a big issue.
 - In review, John restated the proposals that sectors should be kept as its own section, and that sources (strictly defined) should be moved to section 2 of the workplan (better characterizing sources). This would include clarifying certain sources in the list (e.g. water releases) by associating them with a specific sector (e.g., municipal water releases).
- Sections 4 and 5: Coordinating joint priorities with other BTS Workgroups.
 - Dwain suggested that the chairs of the dioxin and HCB/B(a)P Workgroups meet to discuss and coordinate efforts. Anita responded that a half-day joint meeting was attempted at one point and that the effort could be re-initiated.
 - The Workgroup discussed possible participants in this joint meeting. It was suggested that, in addition to the HCB/B(a)P Workgroup, it may be beneficial to have the first joint meeting with the PCB workgroups also, since they could share information on coplanar PCBs, sources, and other issues. Dwain could then collect and present this information. The dates of December 9-10 were suggested for the next meeting, but the timing may conflict with another meeting. Dale Phenicie (CGLI) also added that they may want to talk to the PCB Workgroup lead first, because the PCB Workgroup is different in that it has a very specific mandate to address equipment decommissioning.
 - In section 5 of the Workplan, Dwain suggested modifications to the last sentence.

- Section 6: Address burn barrels. Significant efforts are already underway on this task through the Burn Barrel Workgroup, who meets on a regular basis.
- Section 7: Sound Science. The Workgroup discussed moving ambient monitoring to section 7 of the Workplan. While the Dioxin Workgroup group does not have funds, money is still available from various sources for research and related activities. The Workgroup discussed options for assessing the effectiveness of source reduction activities through the use of environmental monitoring data and modeling. An integrated modeling framework is being built to link reduction to exposure results. The Workgroup then debated the benefits of modeling vs. tracking of trends.

Erin and Anita agreed to incorporate the comments received today into a revised Workplan and to take additional comments through 8/15.

Introduction of Implementation Questions for Future Discussion:

- Who will be responsible for implementing this action – workgroup leaders, other government staff, contractors, or stakeholders?
- Do new workgroup participants need to be recruited for the action? If so, who is responsible for recruitment?
- If new workgroup participants or sector representatives are required, what is the workgroup asking of them specifically? And what can the GLBTS offer to them?
- What exactly are the expected products, outcomes, deliverables, etc. that would result from this action?
- What is the process that will be used to implement the action – government coordination, conference calls, stakeholder leads, ...?

Action Items

- Take comments on the draft Dioxin Workgroup Workplan through 8/15
- Workgroup leads will revise the Workplan
- Schedule October meeting to discuss sources (after 2000 Inventory is released)
- Dwain - prepare “coplanars 101” presentation
- Workgroup leads are to coordinate with HCB and PCB workgroup leads

PARTICIPANT ROSTER
Dioxin/Furan Conference Call
July 31, 2003

Todd Abel	Chlorine Chemistry Council
John Estenik	Ohio EPA
Bruce Gillies	Environment Canada
Tom Hornshaw	Illinois EPA
Jeff Lynn	International Paper
John Menkedick	Battelle
Erin Newman	USEPA
Dale Phenicie	Council of Great Lakes Industries
Jim Roewer	Utility Solid Waste Activities Group
Dwain Winters	USEPA
Anita Wong	Environment Canada